

Remarks

In the Office Action for the parent patent application, Serial No. 09/545040, the Examiner noted that claims 1-34 are pending in the application, and that claims 1-34 are rejected. By this amendment, claim 32 has been canceled, and claims 1, 10, 18, 21, 23, 26, 30, and 34 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-31 and 33-34 are pending in the application.

Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application, in view of the foregoing amendments.

In the Claims

Rejection Under 35 USC 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-20 and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being unpatentable over *Abramson et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,606,670 (hereinafter *Abramson*). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections.

With respect to claims 1, 10, and 26, Applicants have amended the claims to clarify that a result forwarding cache (RFC), unlike a store buffer, also holds instruction results for non-store instructions. *Abramson*'s store buffers do not hold non-store instruction results. Therefore, *Abramson*'s store buffers are not an RFC.

With respect to claim 18, the Examiner correctly asserts that *Abramson* has taught multiple comparators to compare the load address with store buffer addresses. However, *Abramson* has not also taught comparing the load address with store addresses in pipeline stages, i.e., with non-store buffer addresses. Applicants have amended the claim to clarify that the claimed pipeline stages which have store data are not store buffers.

Applicant respectfully asserts *Abramson* does not anticipate dependent claims 2-9, 11-17, 19-20, and 27-29 because they depend from independent claims 1, 10, 18, and 26, respectively, which are not anticipated by *Abramson* for the reasons discussed above.

Rejection Under 35 USC 103

The Examiner rejected claims 21-25 and 30-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Abramson* in view of Patterson and Hennessy's Computer

Architecture: A Quantitative Approach, Second Edition © 1996 (hereinafter *Hennessy*).

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections.

With respect to claims 21 and 23, Applicants have amended the claims to clarify the distinctive meaning of speculative store forwarding, which *Abramson* does not teach.

With respect to claim 30, Applicants have amended the claim to clarify that a result forwarding cache (RFC), unlike a store buffer, also holds instruction results for non-store instructions. *Abramson*'s store buffers do not hold non-store instruction results.

Therefore, *Abramson*'s store buffers are not an RFC.

With respect to claim 34, Applicants believe the distinctive meaning of speculative store forwarding to be clear in claim 34 and are therefore unable to amend the claim to make it more explicit.

Applicant respectfully asserts *Abramson* in view of *Hennessy* does not obviate dependent claims 22, 24-25, 31, and 33 because they depend from independent claims 21, 23, and 30, respectively, which are not obviated by *Abramson* in view of *Hennessy*, for the reasons discussed above.

For all of the reasons advanced above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-31 and 33-34 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested, and Allowance of the claims is solicited.

Applicant earnestly requests the Examiner to telephone him at the direct dial number printed below if the Examiner has any questions or suggestions concerning the application or allowance of any claims thereof.

Respectfully submitted,



E. Alan Davis
Huffman Law Group, P.C.
Registration No. 39,954
1832 N. Cascade Ave.
Colorado Springs, CO 80907
719.475.7103
719.623.0141 fax
alan@huffmanlaw.net

Date: 10-29-03

"EXPRESS MAIL" mailing label number E0001 054 570 US Date of Deposit
11-20-03. I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the U.S.
Postal Service Express Mail Post Office to Addressee Service under 37 C.F.R. §1.10 on
the date shown above and is addressed to the U.S. Commissioner of Patents and
Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231.

By: 